

**REMARKS**

Claims 11, 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner states that the term “foreign substance” is unclear, stating that a person’s contaminates are another’s desired component. The Examiner appears to suggest that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to distinguish between a purposefully-added ingredient of the paste and the “foreign substances”—contaminants that those in the PDP industry try to eliminate from the paste. Applicants disagree.

As stated in the prior responses, a person of ordinary skill in the PDP technology understands the difference between a foreign substance and an ingredient of the paste. In addition, claim terms should be given their broadest “**reasonable**” meanings that are “consistent with the specification” (MPEP 2111). The specification makes clear that foreign substances are substances that are not purposefully added to the paste. Further, page 25, line 20, to page 26, line 5, of the specification discloses how the amount of the foreign substance may be determined. Thus, the specification discloses that a foreign substance is a contaminant, and discloses how “the content of a foreign substance” may be determined. Accordingly, the claim language is not indefinite to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Further, the Examiner states that the limitation “including an inorganic powder” is not limiting as an inorganic powder may include just about anything. However, claim 11 specifies that an inorganic powder comprises “glass, fireproof filler, a phosphor, a metal, or a metal oxide.” Thus, an inorganic powder must at least contain one of these materials.

The Examiner objected to claim 11 for depending from canceled claim 7. Applicants have amended the claim to no longer depend from claim 7. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Singh. The Examiner states that Singh discloses a phosphor paste suitable for application in a plasma

display panel. As stated in Mr. Kazutaka Kusano's declaration submitted on March 14, 2007, Singh's process does not produce a paste having less than 15 mg per 20 kg of foreign substance as claimed. Mr. Kazutaka Kusano personally performed the process set out in Singh to confirm his prediction. Applicants request the Examiner to give the declaration its due weight and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Horiuchi in view of Susumu and Hadankar. In particular, the Examiner contends that adding Horiuchi's paste to Susumu's device would result in the method of claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a method for producing a paste by a disperser having one or more rollers, "each of the rollers having a diameter in the range of 5 to 50 mm and a length in the range of 10 to 100 mm." Support for this amendment can be found on page 5, lines 22-25, of the specification. As shown by Examples 4 and 5 in comparison to Examples 1-3, the diameter and the length of the roller significantly affect the dispersibility of the paste (Specification, Table 1). As shown by Examples 4 and 5, when the dimension of the roller is outside of the claimed range, the dispersibility of the paste is inferior and similar to that of Comparative Examples 1-3. Susumu fails to disclose or suggest the claimed roller dimension, and fails to disclose or suggest that the claimed roller dimension would lead to the superior dispersibility exhibited by the claimed paste. Thus, Susumu fails to teach the advantageous effect of having the claimed roller dimension as well as fails to disclose or suggest the dimension. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests the claimed roller dimension, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is in condition for allowance. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no.

**360842010500.**

Dated: April 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By S. Laura Chung  
S. Laura Chung  
Registration No.: 59,875  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7312